

JUN. 24. 2011 11:56AM

BROWDY AND NEIMARK

NO. 3826 P. 2

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
 READING ACCOUNTING  
 DIVISION  
**JUN 24 2011**  
**2011 JUN 28 PM 4:11**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE****RECEIVED**

In re Application of:	) Art Unit:	)	JUL 11 2011
RADOMSKY	) Conf. No. 4286		
Patent No. 6,600,899	) Washington, D.C.		
Issued: July 29, 2003	) June 9, 2011.		
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR ...	) Atty. Docket: RADOMSKY2		

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

**REQUEST FOR SMALL ENTITY STATUS ERROR TO BE EXCUSED**

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
 Customer Service Window  
 Randolph Building  
 401 Dulany Street  
 Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In the present application, status as a small entity was established in good faith and fees as a small entity were paid in good faith. It has recently been discovered that, between the dates of payment of the first and second maintenance fees in this case, in approximately May 2008, patentee became a large entity. Accordingly, the second maintenance fee was paid as a small entity in error. Applicant hereby withdraws its claim to small entity status for this patent. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.28(c), it is requested that this error be excused as the present communication is in compliance with the separate submission and itemization requirements of paragraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of 37 C.F.R. §1.28.

The following itemization of the total deficiency payment is provided:

Type of Fee	Current Fee for non-small entity	Small Entity actually paid	Date of request	Deficiency owed amount
2 <sup>ND</sup> Maintenance Fee	\$2,480.00	\$1,240.00	10/11/2010	\$1,240.00
			Total owed:	<u>\$1,240.00</u>

JUN. 24. 2011 11:57AM

BROWDY AND NEIMARK

NO. 3826 P. 3

In re USP 6,600,899

USPTO  
RECEIPTS ACCOUNTING  
DIVISION

2011 JUN 28 PM 4:11

On December 21, 2010, a petition was filed stating that the second maintenance fee in this case was paid as a small entity in error and proffering the fee deficiency. The bottom of that document indicates that the USPTO charged \$1,240 to petitioner's credit card on December 21, 2010. However, on January 31, 2011, this petition was dismissed as it was not properly signed by the purported assignee, as it did not meet all of the regulations with respect thereto. The Patent Bibliographic Data page of the PrivatePAIR website shows that the entity for this case is still small. If the deficiency of \$1,240 has already been paid for the second maintenance fee in this case, then please disregard the attached form PTO-2038 and consider the previous payment as satisfying the requirement for payment of the fee deficiency. On the assumption that the deficiency has not been previously charged (or if previously charged, it was refunded), attached hereto is a form PTO-2038 authorizing the additional charges of \$1,240.00, which satisfies the deficiency payment requirement as per the above itemization. If necessary, refund of the fee of \$1,240 previously paid with the denied petition of December 21, 2010, is respectfully requested for the reasons discussed above.

As all of the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.28(c) have been complied with, it is requested that this deficiency payment be accepted and that the errors in small entity status previously made be excused.

Respectfully submitted,  
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /rlb/  
Roger L. Browdy  
Registration No. 25,618

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528